arXiv:0912.3868v1 [math.CO] 19 Dec 2009

# A concentration result with application to subgraph count

Guy Wolfovitz*

## Abstract

Let $H = (V, E)$ be a $k$-uniform hypergraph with a vertex set $V$ and an edge set $E$. Let $V_p$ be constructed by taking every vertex in $V$ independently with probability $p$. Let $X$ be the number of edges in $E$ that are contained in $V_p$. We give a condition that guarantees the concentration of $X$ within a small interval around its mean. The applicability of this result is demonstrated by deriving new sub-Gaussian tails for the number of copies of small complete and complete bipartite graphs in the binomial random graph, extending results of Ruciński and Vu.

## 1 Introduction

Let $H = (V, E)$ be a hypergraph, where $V$ is a set of $n$ vertices and $E \subseteq 2^V$ is a set of $m$ edges. Assume that $H$ is $k$-uniform, that is every edge in $E$ contains exactly $k$ vertices. Let $0 < p < 1$ and let $V_p$ be a random set of vertices constructed by taking every vertex in $V$ independently with probability $p$. Let $H_p = (V_p, E_p)$ be the hypergraph with vertex set $V_p$ and edge set $E_p$, where $e \in E_p$ if and only if $e \in E$ and $e \subseteq V_p$. Let $X := |E_p|$ count the number of edges of $H_p$. The main aim of this paper is to provide a condition which guarantees the concentration of $X$ within a small interval around its mean.

Before presenting the main result, let us give our motivation for studying the random variable $X$. Let $G$ be a fixed graph with $v_G$ vertices and $e_G$ edges. Let $K_N$ denote the complete $N$-vertex graph. Let $H_G$ be the $e_G$-uniform hypergraph with a vertex set consisting of all edges in $K_N$ and with an edge set consisting of all copies of $G$ in $K_N$. If we take $H = H_G$ and then let $X_G = X$, then $X_G$ counts the number of copies of $G$ in the binomial random graph $G(N, p)$ (that is, the graph that is constructed by taking every edge in $K_N$ independently with probability $p$). The study of $X_G$ is a classical topic in the theory of random graphs (see e.g., [1, 2]). Here we are interested in the following problem which was studied by Vu [7, 8] and later also mentioned by Kannan [4].

**Problem 1.1.** *Determine for which $p$ and $\lambda$ does $X_G$ have the sub-Gaussian tails*

$$Pr(|X_G - \mathbb{E}(X_G)| \geq \lambda \operatorname{Var}(X_G)^{1/2}) \leq e^{-c_G \lambda^2}, \tag{1}$$

*where $c_G$ is a positive constant that depends only on $G$.*

Define $\rho_1 = \rho_1(G) := v_G/e_G$ and $\rho_2 = \rho_2(G) := (v_G - 2)/(e_G - 1)$. Using our main result we prove the following.

---

[*] Department of Computer Science, Haifa University, Haifa, Israel. Email address: `gwolfovi@cs.haifa.ac.il`.

**Theorem 1.2.** *If $G$ is a complete or a complete bipartite graph with $e_G \geq 3$, then for every positive constant $c_1$ there is a positive constant $c_2 = c_2(G, c_1)$ such that (1) holds provided $N^{-\rho_1+c_1} \leq p \leq N^{-\rho_2-c_1}$ and $8\ln N \leq \lambda \leq N^{c_2}$.*

Suppose that $G$ is a complete or a complete bipartite graph. A result of Vu [8] implies that for every positive constant $c_1$ there are positive constants $c_3 = c_3(G)$ and $c_4 = c_4(G, c_1)$ such that (1) holds provided $p \geq N^{-\rho_2+c_1+c_3}$ and $c_4^{-1} \leq \lambda \leq N^{c_4}$. Furthermore, when $G$ is a complete graph, one can take $c_3 = 0$. In addition, a result of Ruciński [6] implies that (1) holds provided $1/2 \geq p = \omega(N^{-\rho_1})$ and $\lambda$ is constant. Observe that Theorem 1.2 extends both of these results. In particular, when $G$ is a complete graph Theorem 1.2 in a sense complements Vu's result, as for every positive constant $c_1$ the former handles the case $N^{-\rho_1+c_1} \leq p \leq N^{-\rho_2-c_1}$ while the latter handles the case $p \geq N^{-\rho_2+c_1}$.

## 1.1 Main result

In order to state our main result, we need some definitions and notation. The degree of a vertex $v$ of a given hypergraph is the number of edges of the hypergraph that contain $v$. The co-degree of two distinct vertices $u, v$ of a given hypergraph is the number of edges of the hypergraph that contain both $u$ and $v$. Denote by $\deg_p(v)$ the degree of a vertex $v$ of $H_p$. Denote by $\operatorname{codeg}_p(u, v)$ the co-degree of two distinct vertices $u, v$ of $H_p$. Denote by $\Delta$ (resp. $\delta$) the maximum (resp. minimum) degree of a vertex of $H$. Denote by $\Delta_2$ the maximum co-degree of two distinct vertices of $H$. The following definition provides the condition which will be shown to imply the concentration of $X$.

**Definition 1.** *Say that $(H, p, \lambda, \Gamma, b)$ is* nice *if the following properties hold.*

*(P1) $p \leq 10^{-3}$, $k \geq 3$ is constant and $n \geq n_0$ for a sufficiently large constant $n_0 = n_0(k)$;*

*(P2) $(p^k m)^{1/2} \geq \max\{\ln n, \lambda\}$;*

*(P3) $\Delta_2 \leq \delta \ln^{-3} n$;*

*(P4) Let $p \leq q < 1$. With probability at least $1 - e^{-b\lambda^2}$ we have:*

- $\forall v \in V_q : \deg_q(v) \leq \max\{2q^{k-1}\Delta, \Gamma\}$;
- $p^{1/2}q^{k-3/2}\Delta^2 n \ln n \geq m \implies \forall u, v, w \in V_q : \operatorname{codeg}_q(u, v) \leq \deg_q(w) \ln^{-3} n$.

Let us briefly discuss the condition that $(H, p, \lambda, \Gamma, b)$ is nice. Property (P1) is clear. Property (P2) is equivalent to saying that the expectation of $X$ is sufficiently large – that it is lower bounded by $\ln^2 n$ and $\lambda^2$. Property (P3) says that the maximum co-degree of $H$ is sufficiently small with respect to the minimum degree of $H$, and property (P4) says that with a sufficiently large probability this also holds for $H_q$, provided $q$ is sufficiently large. Lastly, property (P4) also says that with a sufficiently large probability the maximum degree of $H_q$ behaves roughly as we expect it to.

**Theorem 1.3** (Main result)**.** *If $(H, p, \lambda, \Gamma, b)$ is nice then*

$$Pr(|X - \mathbb{E}(X)| > (\ln n + \lambda)\,\mathbb{E}(X)^{1/2}) \leq 2(\gamma_1 + \gamma_2)\ln n,$$

*where, for some positive constant $b_k$ that depends only on $k$,*

$$\begin{aligned}\gamma_1 &= e^{-b\lambda^2} + 2e^{-b_k\lambda^2} + 2\exp\left(-\frac{b_k m}{p^{k-1}\Delta^2 n \ln n}\right);\\ \gamma_2 &= 2\exp\left(-\frac{b_k pn}{\ln^5 n}\right) + 2\exp\left(-\frac{b_k p^k m}{\Gamma^2 \ln^6 n}\right).\end{aligned}$$

Here, a rather simple application of our main result is sketched. Suppose that $H$ is the hypergraph $H_G$ that was defined above, with $G$ being a triangle. In that case, $X_G = X$ counts the number of triangles in $G(N,p)$. We have $n = \binom{N}{2}$, $m = \binom{N}{3}$, $\Delta = \delta = N-2$, $\Delta_2 = 1$ and $k = 3$. Assume that $n \geq n_0$ for a sufficiently large constant $n_0$. Let $p = N^{-1}\ln^{50} N$ and $\lambda = \ln^{10} N$. It is easy to show using Chernoff's bound (see e.g., [2]) that $(H, p, 0.25\lambda, \lambda^2, b)$ is nice for some positive constant $b$. Using this, one can easily see that Theorem 1.3 implies that the probability that $X_G$ deviates from its expectation by more than $(\ln n + 0.25\lambda)\,\mathbb{E}(X_G)^{1/2}$ is at most $e^{-c_G\lambda^2}$ for some positive constant $c_G$. Now, clearly $\ln n \leq 0.25\lambda$ and in addition, for our choice of $p$ we have $0.5\,\mathbb{E}(X_G)^{1/2} < \mathrm{Var}(X_G)^{1/2}$. Thus we infer the following sub-Gaussian behavior: the probability that $X_G$ deviates from its expectation by at least $\lambda\,\mathrm{Var}(X_G)^{1/2}$ is at most $e^{-c_G\lambda^2}$.

We note that for some range of the parameters (e.g., in some cases where $\Delta$ is not bounded and $\mathrm{Var}(X)$ equals up to a constant to $\mathbb{E}(X)$ – as is implicitly the case in the example above and in the proof of Theorem 1.2), Theorem 1.3 does not follow directly from other known concentration results such as Azuma's inequality or Talagrand's inequality (see e.g., [3]), Kim and Vu's inequalities (see e.g., [8]) or the more recent result of Kannan [4]. In addition, we should note that a weaker version of Theorem 1.3 has been used implicitly by the author in [9], in order to prove Theorem 1.2 for the special case where $G$ is a triangle. In fact, in that special case it turns out that better bounds for $p$ and $\lambda$ can be given.

### 1.2 A probabilistic tool

The proof of Theorem 1.3 is based on an iterative application of McDiarmid's inequality [5], which we state now. Let $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \ldots, \alpha_l$ be independent random variables with $\alpha_i$ taking values in a set $A_i$. Let $f : \prod_{i=1}^{l} A_i \to \mathbb{R}$ satisfy the following Lipschitz condition: if two vectors $\alpha, \alpha' \in \prod_{i=1}^{l} A_i$ differ only in the $i$th coordinate, then $|f(\alpha) - f(\alpha')| \leq a_i$. McDiarmid's inequality states that the random variable $W = f(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \ldots, \alpha_l)$ satisfies for any $t \geq 0$,

$$\Pr(|W - \mathbb{E}(W)| \geq t) \leq 2\exp\left(-\frac{2t^2}{\sum_{i=1}^{l} a_i^2}\right).$$

### 1.3 Structure of the paper

In Section 2 we state a technical lemma (Lemma 2.1) and use it to prove Theorem 1.3. That technical lemma is proved in Section 3. Finally, in Section 4 we use Theorem 1.3 to derive Theorem 1.2.

## 2 Proof of Theorem 1.3

Assume that $(H, p, \lambda, \Gamma, b)$ is nice and note that if follows from (P1) and (P2) that $1/n \leq p \leq 10^{-3}$.

Consider the following alternative, iterative definition of the random set $V_p$. Let $\varepsilon \in [10^{-6}, 10^{-3}]$ and let $I \leq \ln n$ be an integer such that $\varepsilon^I = p$. Define a sequence of sets $(V_i)_{i=0}^I$ as follows. Let $V_0 := V$. Given $V_i$, construct $V_{i+1}$ by taking every vertex $v \in V_i$ independently with probability $\varepsilon$. End upon obtaining $V_I$. (Note that this definition does not introduce any ambiguity, as we've defined $V_p$ in the introduction only for $0 < p < 1$.) Observe that for every integer $0 < i \leq I$, $V_i$ has the same distribution as $V_{\varepsilon^i}$. In particular, since $\varepsilon^I = p$, we have that $V_I$ has the same distribution as $V_p$.

We need the following definitions, notation and lemma. Let $0 \leq i \leq I$ be an integer. Let $H_i = (V_i, E_i)$ be the hypergraph with vertex set $V_i$ and edge set $E_i$, where $e \in E_i$ if and only if $e \in E$ and $e \subseteq V_i$. Let $X_i := |E_i|$ be the number of edges of $H_i$ and note that $X_I = X$. For a vertex $v \in V_i$, let $\deg_i(v)$ be the degree of $v$ in $H_i$. For a vertex $v \notin V_i$, let $\deg_i(v) := 0$. For two distinct vertices $u, v \in V_i$, let $\mathrm{codeg}_i(u, v)$ be the co-degree of $u$ and $v$ in $H_i$. Lastly, let $x \pm y$ denote the interval $[x - y, x + y]$.

**Lemma 2.1.** *For every integer $0 \leq i < I$ the following holds. Assume that $(H, p, \lambda, \Gamma, b)$ is nice, and in addition,*

*(i)* $X_i \in \varepsilon^{ki} m \pm \big(i(p^k m)^{-1/2} \varepsilon^{ki} m + \lambda(\varepsilon^{(k+1)i} m p^{-1})^{1/2}\big)$;

*(ii)* $\sum_{v \in V} \deg_i(v)^2 \leq \varepsilon^{(2k-1)i} \Delta^2 n (1 + 3i \ln^{-2} n) + 6k \varepsilon^{(k+1/2)i} m p^{-1/2}$;

*(iii)* $\forall v \in V_i : \deg_i(v) \leq \max\{2\varepsilon^{(k-1)i} \Delta, \Gamma\}$;

*(iv)* $p^{1/2} \varepsilon^{(k-3/2)i} \Delta^2 n \ln n \geq m \implies \forall u, v, w \in V_i : \mathrm{codeg}_i(u, v) \leq \deg_i(w) \ln^{-3} n$.

*Then the following two items hold respectively with probabilities at least $1 - \gamma_1$ and $1 - \gamma_2$, where $\gamma_1$ and $\gamma_2$ are as given in the statement of Theorem 1.3:*

- $X_{i+1} \in \varepsilon^{k(i+1)} m \pm \big((i+1)(p^k m)^{-1/2} \varepsilon^{k(i+1)} m + \lambda(\varepsilon^{(k+1)(i+1)} m p^{-1})^{1/2}\big)$;
- $\sum_{v \in V} \deg_{i+1}(v)^2 \leq \varepsilon^{(2k-1)(i+1)} \Delta^2 n (1 + 3(i+1) \ln^{-2} n) + 6k \varepsilon^{(k+1/2)(i+1)} m p^{-1/2}$.

We prove Theorem 1.3. We claim that for every integer $0 \leq j \leq I$, the following holds: with probability at least $1 - 2j(\gamma_1 + \gamma_2)$, the four preconditions (i) through (iv) in Lemma 2.1 hold for $i = j$. The proof of this claim is by induction. It is easy to verify that (i) through (iv) hold for $i = 0$ with probability 1 (here we use property (P3)) and so the claim holds for $j = 0$. Let $0 \leq j < I$ be an integer and assume that the claim holds for $j$. By the induction hypothesis and Lemma 2.1 we have that (i) and (ii) hold for $i = j + 1$ with probability at least $1 - 2j(\gamma_1 + \gamma_2) - \gamma_1 - \gamma_2$. From (P4) we have that (iii) and (iv) hold for $i = j + 1$ with probability at least $1 - \gamma_1$. Therefore, as needed, we can conclude that (i) through (iv) hold for $i = j + 1$ with probability at least $1 - 2j(\gamma_1 + \gamma_2) - 2\gamma_1 - \gamma_2 \geq 1 - 2(j + 1)(\gamma_1 + \gamma_2)$.

By the above claim and since $I \leq \ln n$, we have that with probability at least $1 - 2(\gamma_1 + \gamma_2) \ln n$,

$$X_I \in \varepsilon^{kI} m \pm \Big(I(p^k m)^{-1/2} \varepsilon^{kI} m + \lambda(\varepsilon^{(k+1)I} m p^{-1})^{1/2}\Big) \subseteq \mathbb{E}(X) \pm (\ln n + \lambda)\, \mathbb{E}(X)^{1/2},$$

where the last containment follows since $\varepsilon^I = p$, $\mathbb{E}(X) = p^k m$ and $I \leq \ln n$. This gives the theorem.

# 3 Proof of Lemma 2.1

Let $0 \le i < I$ be an integer. Assume that $(H, p, \lambda, \Gamma, b)$ is nice and that we are given $H_i$ so that the preconditions (i) through (iv) in Lemma 2.1 hold. We prove below that the first consequence in Lemma 2.1 holds with probability at least $1 - \gamma_1$ and that the second consequence holds with probability at least $1 - \gamma_2$. Let $b_k$ be a sufficiently small constant that depends only on $k$, chosen so as to satisfy our inequalities below. For future reference we record the following useful inequality, which may or may not be valid (depending on $i$):

$$p^{1/2}\varepsilon^{(k-3/2)i}\Delta^2 n \ln n \ge m. \tag{2}$$

## 3.1 First consequence

We have $\mathbb{E}(X_{i+1}) = \varepsilon^k X_i$. Thus, using precondition (i) and (P1) (specifically the fact that $k \ge 3$),

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(X_{i+1}) &\in \varepsilon^{k(i+1)}m \pm \Big(i(p^k m)^{-1/2}\varepsilon^{k(i+1)}m + \varepsilon^k \lambda(\varepsilon^{(k+1)i}mp^{-1})^{1/2}\Big) \\ &\subseteq \varepsilon^{k(i+1)}m \pm \Big(i(p^k m)^{-1/2}\varepsilon^{k(i+1)}m + \varepsilon \lambda(\varepsilon^{(k+1)(i+1)}mp^{-1})^{1/2}\Big). \end{aligned}$$

It remains to upper bound the probability that $X_{i+1}$ deviates from its expectation by more than

$$t_1 := (p^k m)^{-1/2}\varepsilon^{k(i+1)}m + (1-\varepsilon)\lambda(\varepsilon^{(k+1)(i+1)}mp^{-1})^{1/2}.$$

Every vertex $v \in V_i$ has an outcome which is either the event that $v \in V_{i+1}$ or not. Clearly $X_{i+1}$ depends on the outcomes of the vertices in $V_i$ and changing the outcome of a single vertex $v \in V_i$ can change $X_{i+1}$ by at most an additive factor of $\deg_i(v)$. Using McDiarmid's inequality, the fact that $\sum_{v \in V_i}\deg_i(v)^2 = \sum_{v\in V}\deg_i(v)^2$, precondition (ii) and the fact that $i < I \le \ln n$, we get

$$\Pr(|X_{i+1} - \mathbb{E}(X_{i+1})| > t_1) \le 2\exp\left(-\frac{t_1^2}{6k\varepsilon^{(2k-1)i}\Delta^2 n + 6k\varepsilon^{(k+1/2)i}mp^{-1/2}}\right). \tag{3}$$

Suppose that (2) holds. Then the denominator of the exponent in (3) is at most $12k\varepsilon^{(2k-1)i}\Delta^2 n\ln n$. In addition we have $t_1 \ge (p^k m)^{-1/2}\varepsilon^{k(i+1)}m$. Thus, from (3) we get

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr(|X_{i+1} - \mathbb{E}(X_{i+1})| > t_1) &\le 2\exp\left(-\frac{(p^k m)^{-1}\varepsilon^{2k(i+1)}m^2}{12k\varepsilon^{(2k-1)i}\Delta^2 n\ln n}\right) \\ &= 2\exp\left(-\frac{\varepsilon^{i+2k}m}{12kp^k\Delta^2 n\ln n}\right) \\ &\le 2\exp\left(-\frac{b_k m}{p^{k-1}\Delta^2 n \ln n}\right), \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

where the last inequality follows since $p < \varepsilon^i$.

Now suppose that (2) does not hold. Then the denominator of the exponent in (3) is at most $12k\varepsilon^{(k+1/2)i}mp^{-1/2}$. We also have that $t_1 \ge 0.5\lambda(\varepsilon^{(k+1)(i+1)}mp^{-1})^{1/2}$ and $p < \varepsilon^i$. Therefore, using (3) we get

$$\Pr(|X_{i+1} - \mathbb{E}(X_{i+1})| > t_1) \le 2\exp\left(-\frac{0.25\lambda^2\varepsilon^{(k+1)(i+1)}mp^{-1}}{12k\varepsilon^{(k+1/2)i}mp^{-1/2}}\right) \le 2e^{-b_k\lambda^2}. \tag{5}$$

We conclude from (4) and (5) that the first consequence holds with probability at least $1 - \gamma_1$.

### 3.2 Second consequence

Define

$$\eta := \begin{cases} k \ln^{-3} n & \text{if (2) holds,} \\ 1 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Let $Y := \sum_{v \in V} \deg_{i+1}(v)^2$. We start by upper bounding $\mathbb{E}(Y)$. For that we need the next fact.

**Proposition 3.1.** *For all $v \in V$, $\mathbb{E}(\deg_{i+1}(v)^2) \leq (\varepsilon^{2k-1} + \varepsilon^{k+1}\eta) \deg_i(v)^2 + \varepsilon^k \deg_i(v)$.*

*Proof.* If $v \notin V_i$ then the proposition holds since in that case we trivially have $\deg_i(v) = 0$ and $\deg_{i+1}(v) = 0$. Assume that $v \in V_i$. Let $\deg'_{i+1}(v)$ be the number of edges $e \in E_i$ with $v \in e$, such that $e - \{v\} \subseteq V_{i+1}$. Note that $\deg_{i+1}(v) = \deg'_{i+1}(v) \cdot \mathbf{1}[v \in V_{i+1}]$, where $\mathbf{1}[v \in V_{i+1}]$ is the indicator function for the event that $v \in V_{i+1}$. Since $\deg'_{i+1}(v)$ is independent of $\mathbf{1}[v \in V_{i+1}]$ and $\Pr(v \in V_{i+1}) = \varepsilon$, we have $\mathbb{E}(\deg_{i+1}(v)^2) = \varepsilon\, \mathbb{E}(\deg'_{i+1}(v)^2)$.

Clearly $\mathbb{E}(\deg'_{i+1}(v)) = \varepsilon^{k-1} \deg_i(v)$. It is also easy to see that $\operatorname{Var}(\deg'_{i+1}(v)) \leq \varepsilon^{k-1} \deg_i(v) + \varepsilon^k \sum_{e,e'} 1$, where the sum $\sum_{e,e'}$ ranges over all pairs of distinct edges $e, e' \in E_i$ that contain $v$ and share at least 2 vertices. By precondition (iv) we can bound $\sum_{e,e'} 1$ from above by $\eta \deg_i(v)^2$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(\deg_{i+1}(v)^2) &= \varepsilon\, \mathbb{E}(\deg'_{i+1}(v)^2) \\ &= \varepsilon\, \mathbb{E}(\deg'_{i+1}(v))^2 + \varepsilon \operatorname{Var}(\deg'_{i+1}(v)) \\ &\leq \varepsilon^{2k-1} \deg_i(v)^2 + \varepsilon^{k+1}\eta \deg_i(v)^2 + \varepsilon^k \deg_i(v). \end{aligned}$$

■

**Proposition 3.2.** $\mathbb{E}(Y) \leq \varepsilon^{(2k-1)(i+1)} \Delta^2 n (1 + (3i+2) \ln^{-2} n) + 5k\varepsilon^{(k+1/2)(i+1)} m p^{-1/2}$.

*Proof.* By Proposition 3.1,

$$\mathbb{E}(Y) = \sum_{v \in V} \mathbb{E}(\deg_{i+1}(v)^2) \leq \sum_{v \in V} (\varepsilon^{2k-1} + \varepsilon^{k+1}\eta) \deg_i(v)^2 + \varepsilon^k \deg_i(v).$$

By precondition (ii) and (P1) (specifically the fact that $k \geq 3$) and since $6\varepsilon^{3/2} \leq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{v \in V} \varepsilon^{2k-1} \deg_i(v)^2 &\leq \varepsilon^{(2k-1)(i+1)} \Delta^2 n (1 + 3i \ln^{-2} n) + 6k\varepsilon^{(k+1/2)i+2k-1} m p^{-1/2} \\ &\leq \varepsilon^{(2k-1)(i+1)} \Delta^2 n (1 + 3i \ln^{-2} n) + k\varepsilon^{(k+1/2)(i+1)} m p^{-1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that every edge in $E_i$ is counted exactly $k$ times in the sum $\sum_{v \in V} \deg_i(v)$ and so $\sum_{v \in V} \deg_i(v) = kX_i$. Moreover, precondition (i), (P2) and the facts that $p < \varepsilon^i$ and $i \leq \ln n$ give us that $X_i \leq 3\varepsilon^{ki} m$. Hence $\sum_{v \in V} \deg_i(v) \leq 3k\varepsilon^{ki} m$. Thus, since $1 \leq \varepsilon^{i+1} p^{-1}$,

$$\sum_{v \in V} \varepsilon^k \deg_i(v) \leq 3k\varepsilon^{k(i+1)} m \leq 3k\varepsilon^{(k+1/2)(i+1)} m p^{-1/2}.$$

Given the above, in order to complete the proof it is enough to show that

$$\sum_{v\in V}\varepsilon^{k+1}\eta\deg_i(v)^2 \quad\leq\quad 2\varepsilon^{(2k-1)(i+1)}\Delta^2 n\ln^{-2} n+k\varepsilon^{(k+1/2)(i+1)}mp^{-1/2}. \tag{6}$$

Suppose that (2) holds. In that case $\eta=k\ln^{-3}n$. Hence, since $\varepsilon$ is constant by definition and since by (P1) we have that $k$ is constant and $n$ is sufficiently large, we have that $\varepsilon^{k+1}\eta\leq\varepsilon^{2k-1}\ln^{-2}n$. We also have that $6\varepsilon^{(k+1/2)i+2k-1}\ln^{-2}n\leq\varepsilon^{(k+1/2)(i+1)}$. Using precondition (ii) we thus get that

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{v\in V}\varepsilon^{k+1}\eta\deg_i(v)^2 &\leq \sum_{v\in V}\varepsilon^{2k-1}\deg_i(v)^2\ln^{-2}n\\ &\leq 2\varepsilon^{(2k-1)(i+1)}\Delta^2 n\ln^{-2}n+k\varepsilon^{(k+1/2)(i+1)}mp^{-1/2}. \end{aligned}\tag{7}$$

Next suppose that (2) doesn't hold. Then $2\varepsilon^{(2k-1)i+k+1}\Delta^2 n\leq 0.5k\varepsilon^{(k+1/2)(i+1)}mp^{-1/2}$ and $\eta=1$. Therefore, using precondition (ii) and since $6\varepsilon^{1/2}\leq 0.5$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{v\in V}\varepsilon^{k+1}\eta\deg_i(v)^2 &\leq 0.5k\varepsilon^{(k+1/2)(i+1)}mp^{-1/2}+6k\varepsilon^{(k+1/2)i+k+1}mp^{-1/2}\\ &\leq k\varepsilon^{(k+1/2)(i+1)}mp^{-1/2}. \end{aligned}\tag{8}$$

We conclude that (6) is valid since either (7) or (8) hold. ■

In view of Proposition 3.2, it remains to upper bound the probability that $Y$ deviates from its expectation by more than

$$t_2:=\varepsilon^{(2k-1)(i+1)}\Delta^2 n\ln^{-2}n+k\varepsilon^{(k+1/2)(i+1)}mp^{-1/2}.$$

Recall that the outcome of a vertex $v\in V_i$ is either the event that $v\in V_{i+1}$ or not. Clearly $Y$ depends on the outcomes of the vertices in $V_i$. Let $a_v$ be the minimal integer so that if we change the outcome of $v\in V_i$ then we can change $Y$ by at most an additive factor of $a_v$.

**Proposition 3.3.** *For all $v\in V_i$, $a_v\leq 4k\cdot\max\{2\varepsilon^{(k-1)i}\Delta,\Gamma\}\cdot\deg_i(v)$.*

*Proof.* Let $v\in V_i$. If $v\notin V_{i+1}$ then $\deg_{i+1}(v)=0$ and otherwise $\deg_{i+1}(v)\leq\deg_i(v)$. Hence, changing the outcome of $v$ can change $\deg_{i+1}(v)^2$ by at most an additive factor of $\deg_i(v)^2$. Now let $u\neq v$ be a vertex such that $\{v,u,\ldots\}\in E_i$. Changing the outcome of $v$ can change $\deg_{i+1}(u)$ by at most an additive factor of $\mathrm{codeg}_i(u,v)$. Since $\deg_{i+1}(u)\leq\deg_i(u)$, this implies that changing the outcome of $v$ can change $\deg_{i+1}(u)^2$ by at most an additive factor of $(\deg_i(u)+\mathrm{codeg}_i(u,v))^2-\deg_i(u)^2=2\,\mathrm{codeg}_i(u,v)\deg_i(u)+\mathrm{codeg}_i(u,v)^2$. Lastly note that changing the outcome of $v$ can affect only the sum $\deg_{i+1}(v)^2+\sum_u\deg_{i+1}(u)^2$, where $\sum_u$ ranges over all $u\neq v$ such that $\{v,u,\ldots\}\in E_i$. From the above discussion we get that

$$\begin{aligned}a_v &\leq \deg_i(v)^2+2\sum_u\mathrm{codeg}_i(u,v)\deg_i(u)+\mathrm{codeg}_i(u,v)^2\\ &\leq \deg_i(v)^2+4\sum_u\mathrm{codeg}_i(u,v)\deg_i(u). \end{aligned}\tag{9}$$

The proposition now follows from (9), precondition (iii) and the fact that

$$\sum_u \operatorname{codeg}_i(u,v) \le (k-1)\deg_i(v).$$

■

From McDiarmid's inequality and Proposition 3.3,

$$\begin{aligned}\Pr(|Y-\mathbb{E}(Y)|>t_2) &\le 2\exp\left(-\frac{t_2^2}{\sum_{v\in V_i} a_v^2}\right)\\ &\le 2\exp\left(-\frac{t_2^2}{16k^2\cdot\max\{4\varepsilon^{2(k-1)i}\Delta^2,\Gamma^2\}\cdot\sum_{v\in V_i}\deg_i(v)^2}\right). \qquad (10)\end{aligned}$$

We complete the proof by considering the following four cases.

- Assume that (2) holds and $4\varepsilon^{2(k-1)i}\Delta^2 \ge \Gamma^2$. From (2) and precondition (ii) we have that $\sum_{v\in V_i}\deg_i(v)^2$ is at most $12k\varepsilon^{(2k-1)i}\Delta^2 n\ln n$. Also, trivially $t_2 \ge \varepsilon^{(2k-1)(i+1)}\Delta^2 n\ln^{-2} n$. Therefore, from (10) it follows that

  $$\begin{aligned}\Pr(|Y-\mathbb{E}(Y)|>t_2) &\le 2\exp\left(-\frac{\varepsilon^{2(2k-1)(i+1)}\Delta^4 n^2\ln^{-4} n}{1000k^3\varepsilon^{2(k-1)i+(2k-1)i}\Delta^4 n\ln n}\right)\\ &= 2\exp\left(-\frac{\varepsilon^{i+4k-2}n}{1000k^3\ln^5 n}\right)\\ &\le 2\exp\left(-\frac{b_k pn}{\ln^5 n}\right),\end{aligned}$$

  where the last inequality follows since $p<\varepsilon^i$.

- Assume that (2) holds and $4\varepsilon^{2(k-1)i}\Delta^2 < \Gamma^2$. We apply the same upper bound on $\sum_{v\in V_i}\deg_i(v)^2$ and the same lower bound on $t_2$ given in the previous item together with (10) to get

  $$\begin{aligned}\Pr(|Y-\mathbb{E}(Y)|>t_2) &\le 2\exp\left(-\frac{\varepsilon^{2(2k-1)(i+1)}\Delta^4 n^2\ln^{-4} n}{1000k^3\Gamma^2\varepsilon^{(2k-1)i}\Delta^2 n\ln n}\right)\\ &= 2\exp\left(-\frac{\varepsilon^{(2k-1)i+4k-2}\Delta^2 n}{1000k^3\Gamma^2\ln^5 n}\right)\\ &\le 2\exp\left(-\frac{b_k p^k m}{\Gamma^2\ln^6 n}\right),\end{aligned}$$

  where the last inequality follows from the assumption that (2) holds and since $p<\varepsilon^i$.

- Assume that (2) doesn't hold and $4\varepsilon^{2(k-1)i}\Delta^2 \ge \Gamma^2$. This gives us using precondition (ii) that $\sum_{v\in V_i}\deg_i(v)^2 \le 12k\varepsilon^{(k+1/2)i}mp^{-1/2}$. Since $t_2 \ge k\varepsilon^{(k+1/2)(i+1)}mp^{-1/2} \ge k\varepsilon^{k(i+1)}m$, we thus get from (10) that

  $$\begin{aligned}\Pr(|Y-\mathbb{E}(Y)|>t_2) &\le 2\exp\left(-\frac{k^2\varepsilon^{2k(i+1)}m^2}{1000k^3\varepsilon^{2(k-1)i+(k+1/2)i}\Delta^2 mp^{-1/2})}\right)\\ &= 2\exp\left(-\frac{m}{1000k\varepsilon^{(k-3/2)i-2k}\Delta^2 p^{-1/2}}\right)\\ &\le 2\exp\Big(-b_k pn\Big),\end{aligned}$$

  where the last inequality follows from the assumption that (2) doesn't hold.

- Assume that (2) doesn't hold and $4\varepsilon^{2(k-1)i}\Delta^2 < \Gamma^2$. The same bounds on $\sum_{v \in V_i} \deg_i(v)^2$ and on $t_2$ as in the previous item hold. Hence, from (10) it follows that
$$\begin{aligned} \Pr(|Y - \mathbb{E}(Y)| > t_2) &\leq 2\exp\Big( - \frac{k^2\varepsilon^{2k(i+1)}m^2}{1000k^3\Gamma^2\varepsilon^{(k+1/2)i}mp^{-1/2})}\Big) \\ &= 2\exp\Big( - \frac{\varepsilon^{(k-1/2)i+2k}m}{1000k\Gamma^2 p^{-1/2}}\Big) \\ &\leq 2\exp\Big( - \frac{b_k p^k m}{\Gamma^2}\Big), \end{aligned}$$
where the last inequality follows since $p < \varepsilon^i$.

We conclude from the above that the second consequence holds with probability at least $1 - \gamma_2$.

# 4 Proof of Theorem 1.2

Let $G$ be a fixed complete or complete bipartite graph, with $v_G$ vertices and $e_G \geq 3$ edges. Assume that $H = H_G$, where $H_G$ is the hypergraph that was defined in the introduction. Note that $n = \binom{N}{2}$, $m = \Theta_G(n^{v_G})$, $\Delta = \delta = \Theta_G(n^{v_G - 2})$, $\Delta_2 = \Theta_G(n^{v_G-3})$ and $k = e_G$. Let $X_G = X$. Recall that $\rho_1 = v_G/e_G$ and $\rho_2 = (v_G - 2)/(e_G - 1)$. Fix a positive constant $c_1$ and let $c_2 := 0.1c_1/(e_G + c_1)$. Assume that $N^{-\rho_1 + c_1} \leq p \leq N^{-\rho_2 - c_1}$, $8\ln N \leq \lambda \leq N^{c_2}$ and let $\Gamma := N^{c_1}$. We prove that (1) holds. For that, it is safe to assume that $n \geq n_0$ for a sufficiently large constant $n_0$.

The next lemma is proved below.

**Lemma 4.1.** $(H, p, 0.25\lambda, \Gamma, 0.5b)$ *is nice for some positive constant* $b$.

From Lemma 4.1, Theorem 1.3, the assumptions on $H, p$ and $\lambda$ above and the definition of $\Gamma$, it easily follows that
$$\Pr(|X_G - \mathbb{E}(X_G)| > (\ln n + 0.25\lambda)\,\mathbb{E}(X_G)^{1/2}) \leq e^{-c_G\lambda^2},$$
where $c_G$ is a positive constant that depends only on $G$. In addition we have that $\ln n \leq 2\ln N \leq 0.25\lambda$ and that $0.5\,\mathbb{E}(X_G)^{1/2} < \mathrm{Var}(X_G)^{1/2}$ for our choice of $p$. Thus,
$$\begin{aligned} \Pr(|X_G - \mathbb{E}(X_G)| \geq \lambda\,\mathrm{Var}(X_G)^{1/2}) &\leq \Pr(|X_G - \mathbb{E}(X_G)| > 0.5\lambda\,\mathbb{E}(X_G)^{1/2}) \\ &\leq \Pr(|X_G - \mathbb{E}(X_G)| > (\ln n + 0.25\lambda)\,\mathbb{E}(X_G)^{1/2}) \\ &\leq e^{-c_G\lambda^2}. \end{aligned}$$

All that remains is to prove Lemma 4.1. For that we need to show that the four properties given in Definition 1 hold. Property (P1) holds since $G$ is a fixed graph with $e_G \geq 3$, $p \leq N^{-\rho_2 - c_1}$ and $n = \binom{N}{2} \geq n_0$. Property (P2) follows from our assumed lower bound on $p$ and the fact that $k = e_G \geq 3$, which give $(p^k m)^{1/2} \geq N^{c_1} \geq \ln n$, together with the fact that $c_2 \leq c_1$, which gives $\lambda \leq N^{c_2} \leq N^{c_1}$. Property (P3) holds since $v_G \geq 3$ and $\delta = \Theta_G(N^{v_G-2})$ while $\Delta_2 = \Theta_G(N^{v_G-3})$. It remains to show that property (P4) holds. This is done in the next subsection.

## 4.1 Property (P4)

If $v_G = 3$ then $G$ is a triangle and in that case, property (P4) can be easily shown to hold using Chernoff's bound. For the rest of this section we assume that $v_G \geq 4$.

A rooted graph $(R, F)$ is a graph $F$ whose vertex set is the union of two disjoint sets of labeled vertices, $R$ and $S$, where the vertices in $R$ are called the roots and $|S| > 0$. In such a rooted graph, let $\{x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_r\}$ be the labels of $R$ and let $\{y_1, y_2, \ldots, y_s\}$ be the labels of $S$. The density of such a rooted graph is defined to be the ratio $t/s$, where $t$ is the number of edges in $F$ excluding the edges induced by $R$. We say that $(R, F)$ is balanced if for every induced subgraph $F' \subseteq F$ that contains the vertex set $R$ and which has at least $r+1$ vertices, the density of $(R, F')$ is not larger than the density of $(R, F)$.

Let $(R, F)$ be a rooted graph as above (in particular, $|R| = r$ and $F$ has $r+s$ vertices). Let $R'$ be a set of $r$ vertices in $K_N$ that are labeled by $\{x'_1, x'_2, \ldots, x'_r\}$. Let $S'$ be a set of $s$ vertices disjoint from $R'$ in $K_N$. Let $F'$ be a subgraph of $K_N$ over the vertex set $R' \cup S'$ with $R'$ being an independent set in $F'$. We say that $F'$ is an extension with respect to $(R, F)$ and $R'$ if one can label the vertices in $S'$ by $\{y'_1, y'_2, \ldots, y'_s\}$ so that (identifying vertices with their labels):

- $\{x_i, y_j\} \in F$ if and only if $\{x'_i, y'_j\} \in F'$;
- $\{y_i, y_j\} \in F$ if and only if $\{y'_i, y'_j\} \in F'$.

Let $Z_{(R,F),R'}$ be the random variable that counts the number of extensions with respect to a given rooted graph $(R, F)$ and a given set of labeled vertices $R'$ that are contained in $G(N, q)$. The next result follows from Corollary 6.7 in [8].

**Theorem 4.2.** *There is a positive constant $b$ such that the following holds. Let $(R, F)$ be a balanced rooted graph. If $\mathbb{E}(Z_{(R,F),R'}) \geq N^{0.2c_1}$ then*

$$Pr(|Z_{(R,F),R'} - \mathbb{E}(Z_{(R,F),R'})| \geq 0.5\,\mathbb{E}(Z_{(R,F),R'})) \leq e^{-bN^{0.2c_1/e_G}}.$$

Label the vertices of $G$ with $\{x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_{v_G}\}$. Identify each vertex of $G$ with its label and assume without loss of generality that $\{x_1, x_2\} \in G$. Let $(R_1, G)$ and $(R_2, G)$ be two rooted graphs, where $R_1 = \{x_1, x_2\}$ and $R_2 = \{x_1, x_2, x_3\}$. It is easy to verify that $(R_1, G)$ and $(R_2, G)$ are balanced. Let $R'_1$ be a set of two vertices in $K_N$, labeled with $\{x'_1, x'_2\}$. Let $R'_2$ be a set of three vertices in $K_N$, labeled with $\{x'_1, x'_2, x'_3\}$. Let $Z_1 := Z_{(R_1,G),R'_1}$ and $Z_2 := Z_{(R_2,G),R'_2}$. Observe that conditioned on $e_1 \in V_q$, where $e_1$ is the edge that is induced by $R'_1$, we have $\deg_q(e_1) = Z_1$. Furthermore, if for every choice of $R'_2$ and its labelling we have $Z_2 \leq z$ then the maximum co-degree of $H_q$ is at most $2z$. The following lemma together with a union bound argument gives property (P4).

**Lemma 4.3.** *Let $p \leq q < 1$. There is a positive constant $b$ such that with probability at least $1 - 3e^{-b\lambda^2}$,*

1. $Z_1 \leq \max\{2q^{k-1}\Delta, \Gamma\}$;
2. $p^{1/2}q^{k-3/2}\Delta^2 n \ln n \geq m \implies Z_2 \leq Z_1 \ln^{-4} n$.

*Proof.* Let $b$ be the positive constant implied to exist by Theorem 4.2. We show that the first item holds with probability at least $1 - e^{-b\lambda^2}$ while the second item holds with probability at least $1 - 2e^{-b\lambda^2}$.

Let $c_0$ be the minimal positive real for which it holds that $q \geq N^{-\rho_2+c_0}$ implies $\mathbb{E}(Z_1) \geq 0.5\Gamma = 0.5N^{c_1}$. If $q \geq N^{-\rho_2+c_0}$ then we are done since by Theorem 4.2 and the fact that $\lambda^2 \leq N^{0.2c_1/e_G}$, we have that with probability at least $1 - e^{-b\lambda^2}$, $Z_1 \leq 2\,\mathbb{E}(Z_1) = 2q^{k-1}\Delta$. Note that in particular, if $q = N^{-\rho_2+c_0}$ then with probability at least $1 - e^{-b\lambda^2}$ we have $Z_1 \leq 2\,\mathbb{E}(Z_1) = \Gamma$. Thus, by a monotonicity argument we get that if $q < N^{-\rho_2+c_0}$ then with probability at least $1-e^{-b\lambda^2}$, $Z_1 \leq \Gamma$.

Assume $q$ satisfies $p^{1/2}q^{k-3/2}\Delta^2 n \ln n \geq m$. This implies that $q \geq N^{-\rho_2+0.5c_1/e_G}$. From this we infer that $\mathbb{E}(Z_1) \geq N^{0.3c_1}$. Keeping that in mind, if $q$ is such that $\mathbb{E}(Z_2) = N^{0.2c_1}$ then it follows from Theorem 4.2 that with probability at least $1 - 2e^{-b\lambda^2}$, $Z_2 \leq Z_1 \ln^{-4} n$. By a monotonicity argument we can reach the same conclusion for every $q$ for which it holds that $\mathbb{E}(Z_2) \leq N^{0.2c_1}$. Next note that $\mathbb{E}(Z_1) = \Theta_G(N^{v_G-2}q^{e_G-1})$. If $G$ is a complete graph then $\mathbb{E}(Z_2) = \Theta_G(N^{v_G-3}q^{e_G-3})$ and $q \geq N^{-\rho_2+0.5c_1/e_G} \geq N^{-1/2+0.5c_1/e_G}$, which implies $\mathbb{E}(Z_2) \leq \mathbb{E}(Z_1)N^{-c_2}$. If on the other hand $G$ is a complete bipartite graph then $\mathbb{E}(Z_2) = \Theta_G(N^{v_G-3}q^{e_G-2})$ and $q \geq N^{-\rho_2+0.5c_1/e_G} \geq N^{-1+0.5c_1/e_G}$, which again implies $\mathbb{E}(Z_2) \leq \mathbb{E}(Z_1)N^{-c_2}$. Thus, if $q$ is such that $\mathbb{E}(Z_2) > N^{0.2c_1}$ then by Theorem 4.2 we get that with probability at least $1 - 2e^{-b\lambda^2}$, $Z_2 \leq Z_1 \ln^{-4} n$ as needed. ■

# References

[1] B. Bollobás, *Random graphs*, Academic Press Inc. [Harcourt Brace Jovanovich Publishers], London, 1985.

[2] S. Janson, T. Łuczak, and A. Rucinski, *Random graphs*, Wiley-Interscience Series in Discrete Mathematics and Optimization, Wiley-Interscience, New York, 2000.

[3] S. Janson and A. Ruciński, *The infamous upper tail*, Random Structures Algorithms **20** (2002), no. 3, 317–342.

[4] R. Kannan, *A new probability inequality using typical moments and concentration results*, Proceedings of the 50th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (2009).

[5] C. McDiarmid, *On the method of bounded differences*, Surveys in combinatorics, 1989 (Norwich, 1989), London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser., vol. 141, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1989, pp. 148–188.

[6] A. Ruciński, *When are small subgraphs of a random graph normally distributed?*, Probab. Theory Related Fields **78** (1988), no. 1, 1–10.

[7] V. H. Vu, *A large deviation result on the number of small subgraphs of a random graph*, Combin. Probab. Comput. **10** (2001), no. 1, 79–94.

[8] V. H. Vu, *Concentration of non-Lipschitz functions and applications*, Random Structures Algorithms **20** (2002), no. 3, 262–316.

[9] G. Wolfovitz, *Sub-Gaussian tails for the number of triangles in G(n,p)* (2009), available at `http://arxiv.org/abs/0909.2403`.